

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,270	ROBERTS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Oscar A. Louie	2136	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Oscar A. Louie. (3) Mike Scaturro.
 (2) Nasser Moazzami. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Keating et al. US-7171017-B2.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant discussed the issues revolving around the difference between a portion of a frame of an audio/visual signal and an entire frame of an audio/visual signal. A portion of a frame of a audio/visual signal is not equivalent to a frame being a portion of an audio/visual signal. Examiner will re-open prosecution at the point after the first amendment by the applicant, which came after the first non-final action. Agreement was made that the examiner will perform a new search and if proper prior art is found submit a final action to the applicant, otherwise allowance will be considered. Applicant will contact examiner in two weeks time from the date of the most recent telecon for the status of the application to ensure timely prosecution.